

Date: Tue, 2 Feb 93 04:30:19 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #29
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 2 Feb 93 Volume 93 : Issue 29

Today's Topics:

 Net Control signing for others on Net

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 1 Feb 93 14:08:04 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Net Control signing for others on Net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Jon Gefaell states:

> Instead, stations should use 'tactical' callsigns in nets. These are
> portable (station operators can relieve or replace each other in the field)
> indicate relevance in the operation at hand ('rest 1' clearly lets me as Net
> Control know that this transmission is coming from such and such place on my
> map) and should not require phoenetic clarification under any circumstances.

There are many different kinds of nets, and for a tightly organized net with a
changing set of participants, and requiring many short transmissions, tactical
calls are very important (Net Control sure as heck better leave time for
everyone to properly sign every 10 minutes). But for other types of nets, it
can be much more efficient if the individual participants to simply sign after
each transmission. In any event, my original question had to do with whether
Net Control could sign for others on the net, and your reply definitely implied
the answer was no.

--Mark, W03M

Mark D. Phillips, Ph.D.
Department of Radiology and Radiological Sciences
The Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine
600 N. Wolfe Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21205
410/955-9098

phillips@pennsy.med.jhu.edu
wo3m@wb3ffv.md.usa.noam
wo3m@n0ary.#nocal.ca.usa.noam

Date: Mon, 1 Feb 1993 14:19:15 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!spool.mu.edu!darwin.sura.net!uvaarpa!murdoch!
livia.acs.Virginia.EDU!jeg7e@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan30.004752.8147@anomaly.sbs.com>,
<1993Jan30.160622.4612@murdoch.acc.Virginia.EDU>,
<1993Jan31.142945.21642@ke4zv.uucp>
Subject : Re: Net Control Signing for others on Net

>>In article <1993Jan30.004752.8147@anomaly.sbs.com> kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com
(Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>Net ID pileups may be within the letter of the law, but they certainly
>don't satisfy the spirit of the law. Multiple doubling to satisfy the
>ID requirement is horrible practice. The practice followed on traffic
>nets, club nets, and other *directed* nets is as outlined by Michael, a
>single callsign at the end of transmission. That's because it may be more
>than 10 minutes before you are called upon to transmit again, if you
>are called upon again at all. Formal net practice may not be suited
>to tactical emergency nets, but then the FCC is sometimes less upset
>about ID timing and readability in real emergency situations.

>

>When I was running the Kentucky Traffic Net, we often had upwards
>of 100 stations checking in, Vietnam War era, and stations without
>traffic for the net who were present to accept traffic often only
>got *one* transmission during the net unless there was traffic for
>their service area. In a two hour net session, the last thing we
>needed was 100 stations yelling their callsign every 10 minutes.

Actually, that is a very good point. I don't work with traffic nets, but
I clearly see what you are saying.

I do work with ARES/RACES nets. In real emergencies, as you noted, ID'ing
may not be required as strictly as in non emergencies, and during training

nets and public service, Net control can usually find a good time to ID and other stations would do well to 'go with the flow' and ID at that time as well. (usually one at a time, but doubles are inevitable, though a GOOD net would ID in some orderly fashion)

I can see where this wouldn't work with traffic nets. Of course, in ALL situations, common sense should decide these matters... My main point is that a identification using FCC callsign after each transmission is a waste of time, and nonsensical. Tactical callsigns are what are of importance to the net.

>Gary

>--

>Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
>Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
>534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
>Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

--

```
-----\
| Jon Gefaell, Computer Systems Engineer \    /___ | SILENCE = DEATH
| Security and Technology Planning R&D    \  /  /  | Homophobia is a
| I.T.C. Administrative Computing Services \ /  /  | Social Disease!
| The University, UVA. Carruthers Hall     \\/  /  | 73 de KD4CQY
-----\~~~~~
```

Date: 1 Feb 1993 17:21:34 GMT

From: sun-barr!news2me.EBay.Sun.COM!west.West.Sun.COM!l1-a!flloyd@ames.arpa

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Pine.3.04.9301271136.A12343-b100000@pennsy.med.jhu.edu> ,

<1993Jan30.004752.8147@anomaly.sbs.com> ,

<1993Jan30.160622.4612@murdoch.acc.Virginia.EDU>8

Subject : Re: Net Control Signing for others on Net

In article <1993Jan30.160622.4612@murdoch.acc.Virginia.EDU>

jeg7e@livia.acs.Virginia.EDU (John E. Gefaell) writes:

>In article <1993Jan30.004752.8147@anomaly.sbs.com> kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>>I always say:

>>

>><net-related stuff....> Back to net-control. KD1HZ.

>>

>>at the end of each of my net transmissions.

>

>That is poor procedure, and you should discontinue it. The regulations
>require you to sign your assigned callsign ONCE every ten minutes and
>at the termination of communications.

You're making an assumption here. You're taking for granted that net control knows who (in this case) KD1HZ is. There are many different types of 'nets' and procedures differ widely between them. Just because a particular net has different purposes than yours, it does not make their procedures "poor". In the above example, KD1HZ's assumption is that this could well be his last transmission for the evening and so it is appropriate, no, make that mandatory that he close with an ID.

I, for example, host a very large net every third week in the Phoenix metropolitan area. This net is linked with three repeaters and covers Phoenix, Yuma and San Diego. It is also heard in Tucson. Since it is a swap net, you never know who's going to check in. Persons who do check in usually come on, make their listings and then leave, with no intention of making any further transmissions.

This sort of itinerant check in, report and leave activity is very well suited by the "Back to net control, AA7BQ" type of ID. In fact, there is no other way to do it and still be in compliance with the rules.

>Thus repeated identification is not only unnecessary and silly, it is also
>detrimental to the net.

Yes, to your structured net. Not, however, to my open net.

-fred

--
[Fred Lloyd, AA7BQ Fred.Lloyd@West.Sun.COM]
[Sun Microsystems, Southwest Area Solaris Transition Manager]
[Phoenix, AZ (602) 275-4242]

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #29
